



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,259	03/29/2001	Mark M. Ishikawa	60123.801US01	7236
34313	7590	10/27/2005	EXAMINER	
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP IP PROSECUTION DEPARTMENT 4 PARK PLAZA SUITE 1600 IRVINE, CA 92614-2558			DURAN, ARTHUR D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3622	
DATE MAILED: 10/27/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/821,259

Applicant(s)

ISHIKAWA, MARK M.

Examiner

Arthur Duran

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 14-33 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. The Amendment filed on 9/6/05 is sufficient to overcome the prior rejection. A new reference has been added to the 35 USC 103 rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 14-21 and 23-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Angles (5,933,811) in view of Gerace (5,848,396) in view of Messer (2004/0230491).

Claim 14-16, 18-21, and 23-33: Angles discloses a method, system for authenticating the distribution of an advertisement for data and a request for the data in response to the advertisement on a network having at least one user computer and one provider computer, wherein the response to the advertisement is preceded by the distribution of the advertisement to the user computer from an advertiser, comprising:

Art Unit: 3622

creating a confirmation code upon the transmission of the advertisement to the user computer; wherein the confirmation code comprises a first user code (col 3, lines 17-29; col 8, lines 8-16);

associating the confirmation code with the advertisement (col 19, lines 7-11);

transmitting a request from the user computer for the data identified in the advertisement to the provider computer (col 20, lines 16-26);

transmitting a second user information piece generated by the transmission protocols to the provider computer (col 20, lines 47-57; col 7, lines 10-42);

transmitting the confirmation code to the provider computer (col 8, lines 7-15);

determining the authenticity of the data request from the user (col 22, lines 41-50).

Angles further discloses a data interface (col 3, lines 24-30; col 20, lines 16-26).

Additionally, the above features are disclosed in the Figures (Fig. 1, Fig. 4, Fig. 7, Fig. 11).

Angles further discloses preassigning a content provider code (col 3, lines 30-40) and uniquely identifying an advertiser (col 21, lines 5-25; col 25, lines 5-8).

Angles does not explicitly disclose that the second user information piece are codes.

However, Angles discloses that the second user information is categorized and grouped (col 20, lines 53-60) and Angles discloses utilizing codes (col 3, lines 23-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that Angles's information that is to be grouped and categorized can be in the form of codes. One would have been motivated to do this in order to provide the information in a form that is easily transmittable and easily grouped or categorized.

Art Unit: 3622

Also, Angles discloses both a special software data interface (col 3, lines 24-30) and a browser data interface (col 1, lines 45-55; col 4, lines 26-35). Angles discloses creating identifying indicia upon user registration (col 17, lines 10-25) and creating identifying indicia upon providing a specialized data interface (col 3, lines 20-30). Angles discloses that the user computer generates codes for identifying which advertisements from the user computer were viewed or not (Fig. 4, item 12; Fig. 11, item 12; col 19, lines 1-11). Angles uniquely identifies each advertisement that the user views or requests to view (col 20, lines 15-37). Angles uniquely identifies a variety of the actions taken or information displayed by or to the user (col 19, lines 1-11). Angles uniquely identifies when an advertisement is sent to the user, uniquely identifies when a link is provided to the user for clicking on to see an advertisement, and uniquely identifies when the user requests to see that advertisement. Angles was combined with itself to demonstrate that codes can be utilized for these uniquely identified actions and information transmission back and forth.

Additionally, Angles discloses providing a data interface to a user where the data interface is predefined data such as product or service information (col 1, lines 6-12; col 2, lines 19-41).

Angles discloses targeting a user (col 2, lines 28-42).

Angles does not explicitly disclose tracking the time of different user actions.

However, Gerace discloses providing a data interface to a user where the data interface is predefined data such as product or service information (col 2, lines 24-42).

Gerace discloses targeting a user (col 2, lines 30-35).

Art Unit: 3622

Gerace discloses identifying the user computer via user computer ID (Fig. 3D), uniquely identifying each user and user session via referring link, star time, end time, computer ID, etc (Fig. 3E), uniquely identifying all user activity (Fig. 3F; Fig. 3G), and uniquely identifying an advertiser and the advertisements that the advertiser provides (Fig. 5a; Fig. 5D).

Gerace further discloses dynamic generating of identifying indicia, that identifiers can utilize IP address and/or time stamps, that there are identifying indicia comprising user identification code and the advertiser code; and Gerace also discloses a second user identification code sent to the provider computer from the user computer, wherein said second user identification code comprises current user information to identify the user. . .such as user's IP address, time stamp, etc:

“(20) Also the Sponsor and User Objects track how many times each piece of advertisement information is shown to, is selected by and/or spawns a purchase by users. In other words, the Sponsor and User Objects track performance of sponsor provided information, especially advertisements. In the preferred embodiment, a performance routine employs regression techniques to provide performance reports. The performance routine may also be run (executed) remotely by suppliers of the advertisement information (col 3, lines 10-20);

(5) In addition, program 31 records the user's selections and his viewing activity with respect to the agate information. In particular, for each piece of displayed agate information, program 31 records the date and time of user viewing and the format which the user has selected for viewing (col 4, lines 10-15);

(21) Each time a user logs on to program 31, User Session Object 37d records the starting date and time and ending date and time of the session. User Session Object 37d also

Art Unit: 3622

records (a) the referring link from which the user accessed program 31 (e.g., a so called "bookmark" or "hyperlink" which effectively stores and forwards the Web site address of program 31), (b) the user's identification number (e.g., as stored in a so called "cookie" passed by the user's computer upon logging in), and (c) an indication of Web browser software employed by the user's computer. FIG. 3e illustrates the records created by User Session Object 37d to accommodate the foregoing data;

(22) The User Action History Object 37e stores each click of a mouse and corresponding cursor position to effectively record the user's motions/movements in a session. In particular, as illustrated in FIG. 3f, User Action History Object 37e records (a) date and time of action, (b) session identifier (indicating in which session of the User Session Object 37d the subject action occurred), (c) sequence or order number of the action in the series of actions that occurred in a common session, (d) identification of screen view displayed at time action occurred, (e) identification of item selected by user (via click of mouse with cursor positioned on item), and (f) screen position of selected item (e.g., first, second or third menu item, right or left side);

(23) The User Viewing History Object 37f stores information indicative of the screen views displayed to the user in a session. Specifically, User Viewing History Object 37f records an item identification (either agate or advertisement) and orientation of that item for each item displayed to (and hence viewed by) the user in a session. Orientation is noted relative to a page/screen view or an object identified in the "related object ID" field of the User Viewing History Object 37f. Preferably, orientation is indicated as being top, bottom, left, right or background of the screen view. The Viewing History Object 37f also records an identifier (of

Art Unit: 3622

each screen view), ordinal sequence number (number order of screen view within series of screen views displayed in a session), and an indication of the action from which this screen view resulted (i.e., a reference to a corresponding User Action History Object 37e). Lastly, the User Viewing History Object 37f records date and time of screen opening and closing for each screen view. The foregoing is stored in an object table record illustrated in FIG. 3g (col 6, line 45-col 7, line 22);

(50) For each sponsor (or advertiser), a corresponding Sponsor Object 33a (FIG. 5a) stores in a table (or sponsor directory) the company name, numeric identification unique to that sponsor, user contact information and program 31 administrator contact information. Also Sponsor Object 33a records an indication of the demographic profile of the sponsor company itself in order to advertise to the sponsor company user as is appropriate. Further, Sponsor Object 33a indicates standardized report configurations (display preferences, etc.) for that sponsor (col 11, line 64-col 12, line 6);

(63) For a new user, the Home Page 43 effectively requests a user name and password. In response to the user-provided data, main routine 39 immediately builds a cookie if possible. Included in the newly built cookie is a unique user identification code (preferably numeric), time and date of login, and computer identification number to distinguish between home and work logins. Main routine 39/server 27 transmits the created cookie to the user's PC for storage and future use" (col 13, line 61-col 14, line 4).

Note that in Gerace that identifiers are dynamically created and utilized for identifying and tracking the user, to identify the user, the user's actions, the computer ID, the session ID, the advertiser involved, the advertisements involved, the time and date of actions.

Art Unit: 3622

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Gerace's further identifying, tracking, and targeting features to Angles' targeting capabilities. One would have been motivated to do this in order to better target the user.

Additionally, Angles discloses an audit information and an accounting database for tracking a variety of parameters concerning user requests for information (col 15, line 65-col 16, line 15; col 18, line 60-col 19, line 11; col 21, lines 5-25).

While Angles discloses tracking requests for information, Angles does not explicitly disclose tracking invalid requests for information.

However, Messer discloses tracking and auditing user requests for information:

"[0004] It is an object of the present invention to provide a data processing system for tracking, managing, and auditing select transactions between a plurality of computer workstations interconnected via a common network.

[0013] In order to accomplish these and other objects, the present invention includes a data processing system designed and configured to operate on one or more servers interconnected for communication. The data processing system includes a Clearinghouse server programmed to track, manage, and audit associated transactions of Users clicking-through an Content Provider web site and purchasing a product or service from a Merchant. The Clearinghouse server is also programmed to track and report on the level of activity associated with the Users and produce, on a periodic basis, accounting statements for the

Art Unit: 3622

participants directed to the transactions that have transpired during the defined period”.

Messer further discloses tracking both valid and invalid information requests in order to improve commerce on the web:

“[0002]. . .More specifically, the present invention relates to a referral tracking and control system for promoting goods and services on a wide area, public or private access network, such as the Internet .

[0003] As discussed in more detail in the above-referenced parent cases, the present invention includes the ability to track select USER activity while on the Web including interactions with Web pages and click-through navigation to select Web sites where purchases can be executed. Notwithstanding these advancements and advantages, commerce on the web can still be improved upon. Recognizing some of the current difficulties in implementing affiliate programs has led to the innovations presented herein.

[Abstract] An improved processing system for tracking commerce on the Internet provides for subvariable processing and includes web page scanning to discern fraud or improper content to insure proper promotion of select products within the network environment” (Abstract).

Messer further discloses determining invalid requests for information and tracking invalid requests for information, and utilizing a database and reporting for invalid requests for information:

“[0006] It is still another object of the present invention to provide a vehicle

Art Unit: 3622

for the detection of affiliate sponsored fraud; exemplary fraud of concern includes use of a process that employs a Javascript to artificially multiply the number of clicks, impressions and/or sales on a banner or similar promotional piece.

[0026]. . . In its preferred embodiments, the server is configured with a UNIX operating system. Database management software utilizing Oracle.RTM. on an Apache.RTM. Webserver is configured for the specific operating system environment. As discussed below, the Clearinghouse is further equipped to deter fraud and other non-productive activity.

[0036] Turning now to FIG. 2, a high level flow chart depicts the programming logic for detecting click fraud. Logic begins at start block 200 and the system at block 210, pulls and enters the next web page in sequence. With the large number of affiliate web pages makes a sequential review perhaps too involve. Accordingly, the system may use a number of sampling techniques, that provide some policing capability. In this way, counter variable I increments the sampled pages and sends these to the scanning program block 220.

[0037] . . . If this test is also positive, the system generates a report, positively identifying the page as a potential source of click fraud, block 250. Logic then continues at 260.

[0038] In addition to the Javascript detection algorithm, the system further tracks potential click fraud by assessing historical patterns of commerce. For example, if a click-through includes the same ID, the system measures the interval between successive clicks. A

Art Unit: 3622

relatively fast click speed, or multiple clicks at a uniform interval reflects the possibility that the click is machine generated and potentially fraudulent. Other patterns may give further details, such as large jumps in traffic from individual sites.

[0039] For large scale burst traffic generated from a single or a grouped IP address, within a short interval, the apache server of the Clearinghouse is programmed to block such traffic from hitting the database of the ad servers, thus defending the Clearinghouse server from certain types of DOS (denial of service) attacks. Based on these types of detected activity, the system will create a report and trigger further and more comprehensive evaluations”.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Messer’s auditing both valid and invalid requests for information to Angles’ auditing requests for information. One would have been motivated to do this in order to provide prevent fraud, provide better auditing and tracking of information requests, and to provide better commerce on the web.

Messer further discloses utilizing encryption (Paragraph 0032).

Also, Angles further discloses determining the authenticity of the data request further comprises comparing a portion of the identifying indicia and the second user code (col 22, lines 41-50; col 20, lines 47-57; col 11, lines 11-25).

Angles does not explicitly disclose an advertiser code.

However, Angles discloses a content provider code (col 3, lines 30-40) and uniquely identifying an advertiser (col 21, lines 5-25; col 25, lines 5-8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Angle’s identity identifying codes to Angle’s uniquely identifying

Art Unit: 3622

and advertiser. One would have been motivated to do this in order to provide an effective way to uniquely identify an advertiser.

Angles further discloses creating of a confirmation code comprises dynamically generating the first user code and combining the first user code and advertiser code (col 19, lines 1-11).

Angles further discloses that the user computer and provider computers operate in accordance with transmission protocols, and further comprising dynamically generating the second user code via the transmission protocols (col 7, lines 10-42; col 22, lines 41-50; col 20, lines 47-57; col 11, lines 11-25).

Angles further discloses comparing, on the provider computer, a portion of the identifying indicia with the second user code to determine a degree of match; and

providing, from the provider computer, information regarding the degree of match determined by comparing the portion of the identifying indicia and second user code (col 22, lines 41-50; col 20, lines 47-57; col 11, lines 11-25; col 11, lines 20-25).

Angles further discloses storing the advertiser code in a database in association with the advertiser (col 21, lines 5-25).

Claim 17: Angles further disclose utilizing wireless communications (col 9, lines 25-35).

4. Claims 21, 22, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Angles (5,933,811) in view of Gerace (5,848,396) in view of Messer (2004/0230491) in view of Herz (2001/0014868).

Claims 21, 22, and 29: Angles, Gerace and Messer disclose the above invention.

Art Unit: 3622

Angles further discloses utilizing secure communications (col 11, lines 17-26).

Angles does not explicitly disclose utilizing different encryption standards for secure communications.

However, Messer further disclose utilizing encryption (Para 0032).

And, Herz further discloses utilizing different encryption standards for secure communications (Paragraph 287).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Messer and Herz utilization of encryption to Angles' secure communications. One would have been motivated to do this in order to provide standard and readily available technical capabilities for secure communications.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 14-33 have been considered but are moot in grounds of the new rejection. Please particularly note the additional citations in the rejection of the independent claims starting with the section above stating, "Additionally, Angles discloses an audit information and an accounting database for tracking a variety of parameters concerning user requests for information. . .".

Also, Examiner notes that on page 8 of the Applicant's Amendment dated 9/6/05, Applicant states, "Angles does not disclose. . .providing to an invalid response database system if the incoming requests comprises an invalid information request. . .The advertisement audit information disclosed by Angles stored by the accounting database includes information regarding advertisements actually viewed by customers and relates to valid information requests

Art Unit: 3622

only". In response to these new features added to the Applicant's independent claims, please see the addition of the Messer reference above to see how both valid and invalid information requests can be stored for auditing and tracking purposes.

Examiner further notes that it is the Applicant's claims as stated in the Applicant's claims that are being rejected with the prior art. Also, although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). And, Examiner notes that claims are given their broadest reasonable construction. See *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 54 USPQ2d 1664 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

Also, Examiner notes from the Applicant's Specification (2001/0037314) that the data interface can be interpreted in a variety of ways, including as advertisements, and that the data interface provider can also be an advertiser:

"[0037] The data interface 22 is any representation of, or any information directed to, a set of predefined data that the provider, such as, the merchant, desires a user to view. The predefined data can include any type of information, including, but not limited, to product or service information.

[0038] The data interface 22 can contain images, text, multi-media data, such as, commercial-type programming, video clips, any combinations thereof, and the like. The data interface 22 is designed to peak the interest of users, such as, consumers, such that, the user will respond and seek further information about the data, such as a product or service. In one preferred embodiment, the data interface is a banner advertisement that can be placed on a web page.

[0039] The data interface 22 is provided to the user by a data interface provider, such as, an advertiser or advertising agency. Although the data interfaces 22 can be stored on any computer, including the merchant's computer 12, with reference to FIG. 2, in one preferred embodiment, the data interfaces are stored on a data interface provider computer 15, wherein the data interface provider attracts users via various web pages or web sites that include the data interfaces, or advertisements. The data interface provider computer 15 operates in accordance with programs stored on one or more computer readable media to provide content for communication to a user computer 14, and further operates in accordance with standard transmission protocols for network

Art Unit: 3622

computers.

[0040] Generally, although not in all instances, the data interface provider, for example, the advertiser, is not the provider of the predefined data, that is, the data interface provider is not the merchant. In preferred embodiments, the data interface provider is identified by a code or identification. Thus, in the instance of advertisers, an advertiser's identification code is assigned by the merchant to the advertiser such that the merchant can track the advertising results for each advertiser”.

Also, Examiner notes that while specific references were made to the prior art, it is actually also the prior art in its entirety and the combination of the prior art in its entirety that is being referred to. Also, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

a) Johnson (5,813,009) discloses storing invalid requests for information in a database (Fig. 1b; Fig. 3; Fig. 7; Fig. 6; and below):

“(124) If the request for information is rejected during the card/terminal operation, the access card holder will receive a "Not Authorized" message, and the invalid access attempt will be updated on the access card database. If a sufficient number of invalid access attempts are made using any single card, the card will also be invalidated for access until a revalidation routine is performed on the card by an authorized agency.

(134) Information requests not within the card bearer's authority will receive a "not authorized" message and the invalid access attempt will be updated (block 39) to card database 38”;

Art Unit: 3622

b) Callaghan (5,737,523) discloses storing invalid requests for information in a database:

“(25) In some implementations, the NFS server 200 may respond to in authentic NFS clients with more severe security measures. By way of example, the NFS server 200 may record in a file and/or on a system terminal that an unauthenticated NFS request 22 was received from NFS client 12. Depending upon the circumstances, the NFS server 200 may determine that the NFS client 12 is attacking and preclude the NFS client 12 from making further NFS requests. One embodiment of step 436 will be described below in more detail with reference to FIG. 10.

(28) Once the export information table 222 has been searched in step 454, a step 456 determines whether the given file system 30 was found in the export information table 222. The given file system 30 is only present in the export information table 222 when the NFS server 200 is making the given file system 30 accessible for sharing. When the given file system 30 is not found in search step 454, control is passed to a step 458 which returns an error message to the NFS client 12. In some embodiments of the present invention, additional or different security measures may be performed. As described above with reference to FIG. 9, these include logging a message on the system terminal, maintaining a file record of unauthenticated client requests, and/or precluding operation of future NFS requests by the NFS client 12”;

c) Pines (2005/0143064) discloses storing invalid requests for information in a database:

“[0119] As illustrated in FIG. 5D, those requested changes which cannot be implemented are stored in Rejected Updated Listings Tables 52D along with a reason for the rejection, for example, that the user is an invalid user, and/or that the requested changes is a duplicate, and the like”;

d) Wagener (5,793,028) discloses storing invalid requests for information in a database.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

Art Unit: 3622

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arthur Duran whose telephone number is (571) 272-6718. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri, 8:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571) 272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Arthur Duran
Patent Examiner
10/19/2005